# EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

LAW OFFICES

# COHN AND MARKS

STANLEY S. NEUSTADT STANLEY B. COHEN RICHARD M. SCHMIDT, JR. JOEL H. LEVY ROBERT B. JACOBI ROY R. RUSSO RONALD A. SIEGEL LAWRENCE N. COHN RICHARD A. HELMICK WAYNE COY, JR.

MARK L. PELESH J. BRIAN DE BOICE ALLAN ROBERT ADLER CHARLES M. OLIVER

OF COUNSEL MARCUS COHN LEONARD H MARKS

SUSAN V SACHS JOHN R. PRZYPYSZNY WILLIAM B. WILHELM, JR.\*

\*MEMBER PENNSYLVANIA BAR ONLY

SUITE 600 1333 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, N. W. WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036-1573

> TELEPHONE (202) 293-3660 TELECOPIER (202) 293-4827

### **EX PARTE**

March 23, 1995

Mr. William F. Caton Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Suite 222 Washington, D.C. 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re:

CC Docket No. 94-54 Equal Access and Interconnection Obligations Pertaining to Commercial Radio Services; GN Docket No. 93-252 Implementation of Sections 3(n) and 332 of the Communications Act

Dear Mr. Caton

On Wednesday, March 22, 1995, David Gusky and I, Joel H. Levy, met with Commissioner Susan Ness and her assistant Mary McManus to discuss the position of the National Wireless Resellers Association (formerly, the National Cellular Resellers Association) as reflected in the comments filed by NCRA in the above-referenced dockets. At the request of Commissioner Ness, I am also delivering to her by this letter, which is submitted herewith in duplicate, and attaching herewith a copy of a three page document dated January 24, 1994 issued by the NCRA and entitled, "Comparison of Cellular Service Prices in the 30 Largest Markets for Personal Safety and Convenience Use: January, 1988 - January, 1994."

The meeting also discussed the pending petition of the state of California in PR Docket No. 94-105 to retain regulatory authority over intra-state cellular service rates.

Very truly yours

## **Enclosure**

cc:

Commissioner Susan Ness w/enc.

Mary McManus, Esq. w/enc.

No. of Copies rec'd List ABCDE

# NATIONAL CELLULAR RESELLERS ASSOCIATION

# COMPARISON OF CELLULAR SERVICE PRICES IN THE 30 LARGEST MARKETS FOR PERSONAL SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE USE: JANUARY, 1988 - JANUARY, 1994

January 24, 1994

# NATIONAL CELLULAR RESELLERS ASSOCIATION

# COMPARISON OF CELLULAR SERVICE PRICES FOR PERSONAL SAFETY AND CONVENIENCE USE: JANUARY, 1988 - JANUARY, 1984

The following table shows the best rates available in the 30 largest cellular markets for 30 minutes of monthly airtime in January, 1988 and January, 1994. NCRA believes this amount of airtime, divided into 20 minutes of usage during peak hours and 10 minutes of usage during off-peak hours, represents a reasonable calling pattern for individuals using a cellular phone chiefly for personal safety and convenience.

1 <b>966</b> \$ DIT	Market #	City	System	1966	1994	% Change	1984 \$ DIFF
	1	New York	Α	\$32.50	\$39.99	23.0%	
\$3.50			В	\$36.00	\$45.65	26.8%	\$5.66
	2	Los Angeles	Α	\$45.00	\$45.00	0. <b>0%</b>	
\$0.00			В	\$45.00	\$45.00	0. <b>0%</b>	<b>\$0</b> .00
	3	Chicago	A	<b>\$20</b> .00	<b>\$28</b> .35	41.8%	
\$1.00			В	<b>\$2</b> 1.00	<b>\$24</b> .21	15.3%	\$4,14
	4	Philadelphia	Α	<b>\$22</b> .95	\$34.95	52.3%	
\$1.00			В	<b>\$23</b> .95	\$34.65	44.7%	<b>\$0</b> .30
	5	Detroit	Α	<b>\$16</b> .10	\$30.95	92.2%	
<b>\$0</b> .00			В	<b>\$16</b> .10	\$30.95	92.2%	<b>\$0</b> .00
	6	Boston	A	\$22.50	<b>\$33</b> .15	47.3%	
\$3.00			В	\$19.50	\$27.95	43.3%	\$5.20
	7	San Francisco	Α	\$56.00	\$44.74	-20.1%	
\$0.00			В	\$56.00	\$45.00	-19.6%	\$0.26
	8	Wash/Balt	A	\$22.00	<b>\$33</b> .70	53. <i>2</i> %	
\$1.95			8	<b>\$23</b> .95	\$34.65	44.7%	\$0.95
	9	Dallas	Α	\$30.00	\$42.39	41.3%	
\$0.00			8	\$30.00	\$41.95	39.8%	\$0.44
	10	Houston	A	<b>\$28</b> .95	\$31.99	10.5%	
<b>\$2</b> .75			8	<b>\$26</b> .20	<b>\$39</b> .95	5 <b>2.5%</b>	\$7.96
	11	St. Louis	Α	\$23.00	<b>\$26</b> .95	17. <b>2%</b>	
\$0.00			В	\$23.00	<b>\$29</b> .95	30,2%	\$3.00
	12	Miamı	Α	\$30.00	<b>\$52</b> .70	7 <b>5.7%</b>	
\$4.50			В	\$34.50	\$49.55	43.6%	<b>\$3</b> .15
	13	Pittsburgh	Α	\$14.20	\$39.99	181.6%	
\$18.75		<b>3</b>	В	\$32.95	\$38.05	15,5%	\$1.94

\$3.75	Averages	4	\$28.67	\$35.12	+32.4%	\$2.84
\$1.50	30 Portland	A B	<b>\$25</b> .00 <b>\$23</b> .50	<b>\$35</b> .00 <b>\$33</b> .50	40.0% 42.5%	\$1.50
<b>49.70</b>	<b></b>					<b>40.00</b>
\$9.40	29 New Orleans	A B	\$42.90 \$33.50	\$33.95 \$33.95	-20.9% 1.3 <b>%</b>	\$0.00
<del></del>						75.00
\$3.00	28 Indianapolis	A B	\$12.00 \$15.00	\$26.95 <b>\$24</b> .95	124.9% 66.3%	\$2.00
•	28 Indianapolis		\$12.00	<b>\$26</b> .95	124.6%	,
\$6.60	<b>44</b> 1 1100111A	B	<b>\$35</b> .55	\$40.25	13.2%	\$1.00
	26 Phoenix	A	<b>\$28</b> .95	<b>\$39</b> .25	35.6%	
\$13.10	49 DUNAIU	A B	<b>\$2</b> 5.10 <b>\$12</b> .00	\$27.05 \$23.35	94.6%	\$4.30
	25 Buffalo	Α		<b>\$27.65</b>	10.2%	
\$0.00	24 Kansas City	A B	<b>\$25</b> .50 <b>\$25</b> .50	<b>\$33</b> .45 <b>\$35</b> .85	31.2% 40.6%	\$2.40
	24 Managa City	Α.	ege en	<b>693</b> 45	24 20/	
\$0.05	23 Unicinnau	A B	\$17.95 \$18.00	\$30.95 \$24.91	72.4% 38.4%	<b>38</b> .04
	23 Cincinnati	A	<b>\$</b> 17.95	<b>\$30</b> .95	72.4%	
\$0.80	22 Tampa	A B	<b>\$26</b> .80 <b>\$27</b> .60	\$34.95 \$46.45	30.4% 68.3%	\$11.50
-	22 Tames					
\$1.30	21 Milwaukee	A B	<b>\$20</b> .00 <b>\$21</b> .30	<b>\$29.95</b> <b>\$27.</b> 00	49.7% 26.8%	\$2.95
<b>411</b> .7 <b>3</b>		_	•			<b>40.0</b> (
\$11.75	20 Seattle	A B	<b>\$29</b> .50 <b>\$4</b> 1.25	<b>\$29.99</b> <b>\$29.</b> 95	1. <b>7%</b> -27.4%	<b>\$0</b> .04
<del>-</del>		•				
\$6.05	19 Denver	A B	<b>\$29</b> .50 <b>\$35</b> .55	\$ <b>36</b> .59 <b>\$36</b> .95	24.0% 3. <b>9%</b>	\$0.36
	40 Decision	A		e20 50		•
\$8.35	18 San Diego	A B	<b>\$45</b> .00 <b>\$36</b> .65	\$ <b>36</b> .55 \$38.00	-18. <b>8%</b> 3. <b>7%</b>	\$1.45
50.50						40.00
\$0.00	17 Atlanta	A B	\$40.00 \$40.00	<b>\$33</b> .70 \$41.75	-15.7% 4. <b>4%</b>	\$8.05
00.00						V25
\$0.05	16 Cleveland	A B	\$27.95 \$28.00	<b>\$30.95</b> \$ <b>29.</b> 75	10.7% 6. <b>3</b> %	\$1.20
			997.00	***	40.70	
\$6.60	13 Millineapons	B	\$3 <b>5</b> .55	\$3 <b>5</b> .85	0. <b>8%</b>	\$3. <del>6</del> 1
-	15 Minneapolis	~ <b>A</b>	528 Q5	\$32.24	11.4%	

The monthly airtime charges contained in this report were calculated by using data obtained from Information Enterprises and the customer service departments of the licensed carriers in each market listed above. The monthly airtime charges reflect the best rates available on service contracts not exceeding one year in length.